



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Serge Jean Maurice Mister  
Serial No.: 09/343,958  
Filing Date: June 30, 1999  
Confirmation No.: 8512

Examiner: Kambiz Zand  
Art Group: 2132  
Docket No.: 0500.9904131  
Our File No.: 10500.99.4131

Title: **METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PREVENTING INTERCEPTION OF  
INPUT DATA TO A SOFTWARE APPLICATION**

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

*Certificate of First Class Mailing*  
*I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the*  
*United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an*  
*envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for*  
*Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on*  
*this date.*

2/23/05  
Date

Christine A. Wright  
Christine A. Wright

**AFTER FINAL RESPONSE**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed December 23, 2004, Applicant submits the following remarks.

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 10-15 and 24-29 are allowed and that claims 6, 8, 21, 23, 35 and 37 would be allowable if rewritten to include limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Remaining claims 1-5, 7, 9, 16-20, 22, 30-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fadem et al. in view of Young et al. In the "Response to Arguments" section of the final action, the Examiner states that Applicant's previous arguments were not persuasive because "the features upon which Applicant relies are not cited" in the rejected claims. However, the office action cites "insertion of fake data" as the feature upon which Applicant relies to overcome the references. It appears that the Examiner